

From: bfox@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,webmaster@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw,att...
Date: 12/28/01 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a citizen of the United States and the State of Massachusetts,
I am dissatisfied with the proposed settlement of the Microsoft
Antitrust
settlement, announced on or about Nov. 20, 2001.

The proposed settlement, to compel Microsoft to donate \$1B in SW, HW,
and services
to K-12 schools, will further entrench Microsoft's image as the only OS
option in the
minds of children. What about the competitors. Thats what this is all
about. The settlement
is effectively a windfall for Microsoft.
Microsoft's marketing division probably views this settlement as \$1B
windfall
How will we have Microsoft account forthe "cost" of \$1 Billion in
exquipment, software, and services?
I am sure Microsoft will argue for "full cost", while their true cost is
nil.
Consider the economics of the software industry.
Software creation is 90% of a product's cost, reproduction is 2%.

The toothless settlement proposed will only further encourage Microsoft,
and
corporate America at large, to flaunt the DOJ as merely a nuisance to
business as usual,
not a formidable market police body to be respected.

I suggest restrictions of Microsoft's market access. It is clear
Microsoft is moving
on other facets of the IT industry such as online services,
entertainment, and telephony.
Perhaps a settlement that freezes them out of several of these
industries to prevent them
from further controlling the technology infrastructure of this country.
Similar to the AT&T
settlement of the early 80s
Another option is to limit Microsoft's access to Federl and State
contract awards for a period
of several years, limiting them to XX% of all awarded contract \$\$s
These types of punishments show teeth to the DOJ's and State AG's
actions.

--

William J. Fox

Director of Systems Architecture

400 West Cummings Park
Suite 2350
Woburn, MA 01801
781-938-7283 x272
781-389-3110 (mobile)